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## Yemen DA

#### Drones in Yemen now – key to prevent AQAP resurgence and Yemen government collapse

Terrill 13

W. Andrew Terrill, Strategic Studies Institute, SSI’s Middle East specialist, served as a Middle East nonproliferation analyst for the Inter- national Assessments Division of the Lawrence Liver- more National Laboratory, PhD in international relations from Claremont, “The Struggle for Yemen and the Challenge of Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula”, June 2013 //jchen

In his February 2012 inauguration speech, Hadi called for, “the continuation of the war against al- Qaeda as a religious and national duty.” AQAP re- sponded to his assertiveness with considerable fe- rocity by striking Yemeni government targets with suicide bombings and other acts of terrorism. These strikes were made in order to further challenge the government before Hadi could consolidate his author- ity. Even more significantly, AQAP won a major battle in southern Yemen during this time frame by attack- ing unprepared troops, most of whom appear to have been asleep after posting inadequate security. Despite this defeat, the government launched an offensive in the summer of 2012 to remove AQAP and Ansar al- Shariah from the territory they had seized in southern Yemen. The Yemeni offensive was conducted with a force of around 20,000 regular army soldiers, support- ed by significant numbers of paid local tribal auxilia- ries. Saudi Arabia provided considerable financial as- sistance to support the operation, and it appears that a large share of the Saudi funds may have been used to hire the tribal militia auxiliaries requested to sup- port the army. These types of fighters have often been highly effective in the kinds of combat that take place in Yemen. In the face of this attack, AQAP fought back proficiently and also conducted several spectacular terrorist attacks in Sanaa. Fortunately, the military pre- vailed against this resistance, and AQAP forces were ultimately driven from the urban areas that they had previously occupied.

In the 2012 government offensive, the internation- al press reported the widespread use of U.S. drones, which, according to those same reports, may have tipped the tide of battle by gathering intelligence and serving to eliminate key insurgent leaders at impor- tant points in the campaign. While drone use has many political drawbacks, the possibility that it helped de- termine the outcome of the summer offensive is worth considering. If the Yemeni military had been defeated by AQAP in this effort, the government might have collapsed at an excruciatingly sensitive time, possibly leaving the country in anarchy. Such a defeat would also create the conditions for an even more deeply rooted AQAP presence in southern Yemen, with no countervailing Yemeni authority capable of moving against it. The success of the government’s southern offensive would therefore seem to have been vitally important to U.S. national interests in the region. If Yemeni forces had failed, and particularly if they had failed ignominiously, a newly energized terror- ist movement could have plagued the region and the world.

Unfortunately, despite the 2012 victory, the struggle for control of Yemen is still subject to uncertainty, and an AQAP insurgent comeback there remains a disturbing possibility. Moreover, the use of U.S. drones to ensure Yemeni security has already been seen to be deeply unpopular among many Yemeni citizens. Consequently, drones should not be treated as a long- term solution to that country’s security problems. A more optimal long-term solution is a Yemeni military that is capable of maintaining national security with- out the direct involvement of foreign forces. Military reform, therefore, remains a vital aspect of dealing with Yemen’s security issues. Yemeni forces are cur- rently making some progress in this regard, and Presi- dent Hadi has made a strong effort to modernize the military’s structure and eliminate the warlord-style leadership of some Yemeni commanders.

#### The aff opposes the President’s military drone strikes

#### Impact is WMD terror, Iran-Israel war, and Iran-Saudi war.

Berger et al 2012(May, Lars Berger, Lecturer in politics and contemporary history of the middle east at the university of salford/Manchester, Maurice Doring, MA in political science, international law and philosophy from the University of Bonn, Sven-Eric Fikenscher, research fellow at Geothe University, Ahmed Salf, Exeutive Director of the Sheba Center for Strategic Studies, Ahmed Al-Wahishi, Executive Secretary of the Yemeni International Affairs Center, “Yemen and the Middle East Conference The Challenge of Failing States and Transnational Terrorism”, <http://usir.salford.ac.uk/22952/1/Yemen_and_the_Middle_East_Conference.pdf>)

 While in a geographical and political sense Yemen is far from being a central actor in the envisioned MEC, its political future could easily shape the gathering on several levels. First, the Middle East Conference aims at establishing a WMD/DVs Free Zone. On the one hand, Yemen is a party to all three legal documents banning weapons of mass destruction: the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), and the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). In addition, Sana’a has embraced the Gulf Cooperation Council’s (GCC) call for a Gulf WMD Free Zone, independent of Israeli nuclear policy. On the other hand, when it comes to the problématique of WMD and proliferation, Yemen might store chemical weapons, depending on whether rumors about the use of nerve gas against anti- government protesters in early 2011 turn out to be true. In addition, Yemen imported various WMD-capable aircraft and missiles and probably still operates most of them (see Table No. 1). In the aircraft realm, Yemeni decision-makers from the North, the South, and the unifi ed country alike have mostly received Soviet/Russian fighter jets and bombers. 1 The current level of instability and the threat of further deterioration could thus spoil any serious arms control effort in Yemen. This is particularly troublesome since the country, given its history and affiliation with the Arab League, will have to be part of far- reaching regional disarmament initiatives. The prospect of an Arab state with an uncontrolled chemical arsenal is likely to affect Israeli and Iranian calculations with regard to the MEC. Both states are suspicious of the Arab League and tensions between Iran and Saudi Arabia, which is particularly influential in Yemen, have recently worsened. Second, with a long history as one of the region’s eminent weapons markets, Yemen has the potential to serve as a major gateway for illicit weapons, both conventional and unconventional, entering the Arab peninsula and other parts of the Arab East. If the situation escalates, states with an interest in such technology might, for instance, try to obtain missiles and their spare parts or attempt to gain access to sensitive material from the country’s suspected chemical warheads. This could contribute to the prolif- eration of delivery systems as well as WMD thereby undermining the MEC. In 2011, protesters seized an army base in Sana’a, while Al-Qaeda in the Arab Peninsula (AQAP) has, on a frequent basis, been able to temporarily control several cities and launch deadly assaults on military bases in the southern province of Abyan. Such developments could offer AQAP the chance to use existing dual-use laboratories or even to build their own facilities capable of producing biological and chemical material in remote areas under their control. Third, Yemen has the potential to play a more prominent role in the ongoing tensions between Saudi Arabia and Iran. Riyadh has a long history of attempts to shape the course of political events in Yemen with which it shares a 1,800 km-long border. Saudi Arabia’s different reactions to domestic calls for change in Bahrain and Syria have made clear that it is viewing the ‘Arab Spring’ primarily through the lens of its long-running conflict with Iran. From a Saudi point of view, instability in Yemen opens up the specter of increased Iranian influence at a time when Tehran’s foothold in the Arab world’s northern tier comes under strain in the context of the popular uprising against the Assad regime in Syria. a number of narrowly foiled terrorist attacks on U.S. targets and the 2009 Fort Hood shooting in Texas have shifted global attention towards Yemen’s status as the home to Al-Qaeda in the Arab Peninsula. Continuing instability in Yemen allows AQAP to regroup and pose a direct threat to the security of Saudi Arabia and other countries on the Arab peninsula. It also puts AQAP into a position to intensify its support for the ‘home-grown’ attempted terrorist attacks the United States has witnessed over the last couple of years. In short, Yemen’s instability has the potential to allow transnational actors to undermine the security arrangements which the region’s state actors might contemplate as part of the envisioned MEC.

#### Iran-Saudi war goes nuclear.

Jain, visiting fellow at The Washington Institute, 11 [Ash, served as a member of the State Department’s Policy Planning Staff from 2004 to 2010, Nuclear Weapons and Iran’s Global Ambitions, Washington Institute, Policy Focus 114, August, 2011, ]

As it looks for plausibly deniable ways to intimidate and subvert Gulf monarchies, an emboldened Iran could decide to direct terrorist attacks in the Gulf, possibly even targeting U.S. interests. Moreover, Gulf efforts to contain and deter Iran could escalate tensions in the region and increase the risk of violence and conflict. A military confrontation between Iran and the Gulf states—both potentially armed with nuclear weapons—could have drastic consequences. While crisis diplomacy might succeed in containing its impact, any such confrontation could seriously undermine regional security, disrupt global energy supplies, and threaten global economic and financial stability. U.S. military intervention might also be necessary at some point—though this could be complicated in the face of a nuclear Iran

### Shift DA

#### The U.S. is committed to counterterrorism – absent drones they would find alternatives

Wittes and Singh 12

Benjamin Wittes Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, where he is the Research Director in Public Law, and Co-Director of the Harvard Law School - Brookings Project on Law and Security, and Ritika Singh project coordinator at the Brookings Institution where she focuses on national security law and policy, 1/24/12, “The Droneless Counterfactual”, http://www.cato-unbound.org/2012/01/24/benjamin-wittes-ritika-singh/droneless-counterfactual //jchen

Cortright’s example, the use of drones along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, is a case in point. He notes Defense Secretary Panetta’s argument that drones are the “only game in town” and explains why this is: They are more precise than conventional air strikes, and “Ground operations by commando units … would entail severe risks to our troops” (emphasis added). The result is that the availability of drones creates a military option where none would otherwise exist.

Just to be clear, I prefer that American troops be deployed with a minimum of “severe risks.” And Cortright’s confidence that absent drones, policymakers would not perceive “severe risks to our troops” as risks worth taking to confront al Qaeda seems misplaced to me. One cannot assume that because major troop commitments are politically unthinkable given the availability of lesser uses of force that they would be similarly unthinkable in the absence of these alternative military means. Cortright assumes that absent drones, the United States would simply not be engaged militarily in Pakistan. His assumption is naive. Absent drones, American involvement in Pakistan would probably be militarily messier, greater, and bloodier on both sides. It is a mistake that colors his entire argument.

#### The alternatives are bombs and cruise missiles – drastically increases civilian casualties

The News Tribune 13

The News Tribune, “Drones: Wise, maybe; constitutional, certainly”, 2/17/13, http://www.thenewstribune.com/2013/02/17/2478932/drones-wise-maybe-constitutional.html //jchen

The realistic alternative to drone strikes include kidnapping – something many of the same critics condemn – and conventional air strikes.

Bombs and cruise missiles are far less humane than Predators, though, when targeting enemies who deliberately hide themselves among civilians. By all accounts, drones – which can linger in the air until the target is reasonably identified and isolated – have drastically reduced the deaths of innocent bystanders.

### Case

#### A) No root cause

#### 1. No root cause of war.

Gat, Political Science at Tel Aviv, 9 [Azar, Chair of the Department of Political Science at Tel Aviv University, So Why Do People Fight? Evolutionary Theory and the Causes of War, European Journal of International Relations, 2009, Vol. 15(4): 571–599, http://ejt.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/15/4/571]

Thus attempts to find the root cause of war in the nature of either the individual, the state, or the international system are **fundamentally misplaced**. In all these ‘levels’ there are necessary but not sufficient causes for war, and **the whole cannot be broken into pieces**.13 People’s needs and desires — which may be pursued violently — as well as the resulting quest for power and the state of mutual apprehension which fuel the security dilemma are all **molded in human nature** (some of them existing only as options, potentials, and skills in a behavioral ‘tool kit’); they are so molded because of strong evolutionary pressures that have shaped humans in their struggle for survival over geological times, when all the above literally constituted matters of life and death. The violent option of human competition has been largely curbed within states, yet is occasionally taken up on a large scale between states because of the anarchic nature of the inter-state system. However, returning to step one, international anarchy in and of itself would not be an explanation for war were it not for the potential for violence in a fundamental state of competition over scarce resources that is imbedded in reality and, consequently, in human nature. The necessary and sufficient causes of war — that obviously have to be filled with the **particulars of the case** in any specific war — are thus as follows: politically organized actors that operate in an environment where no superior authority effectively monopolizes power resort to violence when they assess it to be their most cost-effective option for winning and/or defending evolution-shaped objects of desire, and/or their power in the system that can help them win and/or defend those desired goods. Wars have been fought for the attainment of the same objects of human desire that underlie the human motivational system in general — only by violent means, through the use of force. Politics — internal and external — of which war is, famously, a continuation, is the activity intended to achieve at the intra- and inter-state ‘levels’ the very same evolution-shaped human aims we have already seen. Some writers have felt that ‘politics’ does not fully encompass the causes of war. Even Thayer (2004: 178–9), who correctly argues that evolutionary theory explains ultimate human aims, nonetheless goes on to say, inconsistently, that Clausewitz needs extension because war is caused not only by political reasons but also by the evolutionarily rooted search for resources, as if the two were separate, with politics being somehow different and apart, falling outside of the evolutionary logic. What is defined as ‘politics’ is of course a matter of semantics, and like all definitions is largely arbitrary. Yet, as has been claimed here, if not attributed to divine design, organisms’ immensely complex mechanisms and the behavioral propensities that emanate from them — including those of human beings — ultimately could only have been ‘engineered’ through evolution. The challenge is to lay out how evolution-shaped human desires relate to one another in motivating war. The desire and struggle for scarce resources — wealth of all sorts — have always been regarded as a prime aim of ‘politics’ and an obvious motive for war. They seem to require little further elaboration. By contrast, reproduction does not appear to figure as a direct motive for war in large-scale societies. However, as we saw, appearance is often deceptive, for somatic and reproductive motives are the two inseparable sides of the same coin. In modern societies, too, sexual adventure remained central to individual motivation in going to war, even if it usually failed to be registered at the level of ‘state politics.’ This may be demonstrated by the effects of the sexual revolution since the 1960s, which, by lessening the attraction of foreign adventure for recruits and far increasing the attraction of staying at home, may have contributed to advanced societies’ growing aversion to war. Honor, status, glory, and dominance — both individual and collective — enhanced access to somatic and reproductive success and were thus hotly pursued and defended, even by force. The security dilemma sprang from this state of actual and potential competition, in turn pouring more oil onto its fire. Power has been the universal currency through which all of the above could be obtained and/or defended, and has been sought after as such, in an often escalating spiral. Kinship — expanding from family and tribe to peoples — has always exerted overwhelming influence in determining one’s loyalty and willingness to sacrifice in the defense and promotion of a common good. Shared culture is a major attribute of ethnic communities, in the defense of which people can be invested as heavily as in the community’s political independence and overall prosperity. Finally, religious and secular ideologies have been capable of stirring enormous zeal and violence; for grand questions of cosmic and socio-political order have been perceived as possessing paramount practical significance for securing and promoting life on earth and/or in the afterlife. In the human problem-solving menus, ideologies function as the most general blueprints. Rather than comprising a ‘laundry list’ of causes for war, all of the above partake in the **interconnected human motivational system**, originally shaped by the calculus of survival and reproduction.

#### 2. War decreasing disproves your root cause claims.

Fettweis 10 [Christopher J., fifth year doctoral student in the University of Maryland's Department of Government and Politics. His primary interests include US foreign and national security policies. His dissertation, currently titled The Geopolitics of Energy and the Obsolescence of Major War, focuses on the relationship between oil and conflict. Mr. Fettweis has a BA in History from the University of Notre Dame, Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy, April 2010 Survival, 52:2, 59 - 82]

Not only is the invasion and conquest of the United States virtually unthinkable, but warfare of all kinds is everywhere on the decline. Since the end of the Cold War, inter-and intra-national conflict and crises have **steadily declined** in number and intensity.18 The risk for the average person of dying in battle has plummeted since the Second World War, especially since the end of the Cold War.19 The incidence of new wars is also at an **all-time low**.20 Only one international war has been fought since the invasion of Iraq, and it can be counted only if the common understanding of 'war' is stretched a bit. Despite the sound and fury that accompanied the 2008 Russo-Georgian clash, the combined battle-death figure appears to be under 1,000, which means it would not even qualify as a war using the most-used definitions.21 By virtually all measures, **the world is a far more peaceful place than it has been at any time in recorded history.**

#### 3. Enemyship is an inevitable psychological response – most recent and comprehensive studies.

Sullivan et al. 10 [Daniel Sullivan1, Mark J. Landau1, Zachary K. Rothschild1, 1Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, An Existential Function of Enemyship: Evidence That People Attribute Influence to Personal and Political Enemies to Compensate for Threats to Control, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, March 2010, Vol. 98, No. 3, p 434-449]

General Discussion On the basis of Becker’s (1969) existential theorizing, we have proposed that perceiving the self as having powerful enemies serves a psychological function for the individual by compensating for threatened perceptions of control over one’s environment. Specifically, enemies serve as psychological focal points for what are otherwise diffuse threats to one’s life and well-being that are impossible to fully anticipate or control. This analysis suggests that people will imbue enemy figures with exaggerated influence and power when feelings of control are threatened and that perceiving powerful enemies capable of perpetrating diffuse misdeeds will bolster feelings of personal control by reducing perceptions of chaotic risks in one’s environment. The **current studies provide the first empirical tests of these claims.** Study 1 showed that when people were reminded of the prevalence of chaotic hazard in their environment, those individuals characterized by dispositionally low feelings of personal control were more likely to view a personal enemy as having influence over their lives, but this effect did not extend to perceptions of a generically aversive other. Study 2 provided a conceptual replication of this effect on perceptions of a political enemy in a more ecologically valid context, with an experimental manipulation of perceived control over chaotic hazards. In accord with predictions, situationally reduced feelings of personal control increased participants’ belief that a public enemy figure—the opponent of their chosen candidate in the 2008 U.S. presidential election—was wielding power to surreptitiously manipulate the election. This study furthermore showed that the hypothesized effect was not simply due to an increase in generalized suspiciousness, concern with unwanted election outcomes, or generally negative evaluations of the enemy candidate. Supplementing Becker’s (1969) analysis with M. Douglas’s (1966) account of cultural differences in enemyship, we hypothesized that enemyship will be an **especially attractive means** of compensating for control threats when the broader social system is perceived as disordered and incapable of providing protection from harm, whereas bolstering the perceived strength of the system will be the preferred response when the system appears ordered and secure. The results of Study 3 supported this hypothesis: Participants led to view the prevailing system as disordered responded to a control threat by viewing a personal enemy as responsible for negative occurrences in their lives and by denying the influence of random forces on negative occurrences. However, these participants were no more likely to attribute positive life events to a friend’s influence. In contrast, and in line with Kay et al.’s (2008) findings, participants led to view the system as ordered responded to control threats by bolstering their belief in the system’s order and strength. Study 4 tested whether perceiving an enemy capable of causing diffuse harms would actually decrease perceived risk in the world and thereby bolster feelings of personal control. As predicted, control-threatened participants who were exposed to an ambiguously powerful enemy (but not one whose powers were explicitly known or who was weak) showed reduced perceptions of chaotic risk, which in turn bolstered perceptions of personal control. Taken together, the current studies are the **first** to systematically examine the psychological function served by perceiving powerful enemies in the world, while additionally providing evidence of the psychological process by which enemies serve a control-restorative function, and the situational conditions under which people are more likely to exaggerate an enemy’s power and influence as a means of compensating for personal control concerns.

#### B) Impact Framing

#### Extinction first.

Nick Bostrom, Department of Philosophy, Yale University, 2002, “Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards,” [http://www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html //](http://www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html%20//) vkoneru

Our approach to existential risks cannot be one of trial-and-error. There is no opportunity to learn from errors. The reactive approach – see what happens, limit damages, and learn from experience – is unworkable. Rather, we must take a proactive approach. This requires foresight to anticipate new types of threats and a willingness to take decisive preventive action and to bear the costs (moral and economic) of such actions. We cannot necessarily rely on the institutions, moral norms, social attitudes or national security policies that developed from our experience with managing other sorts of risks. Existential risks are a different kind of beast. We might find it hard to take them as seriously as we should simply because we have never yet witnessed such disasters.[5] Our collective fear-response is likely ill calibrated to the magnitude of threat. Reductions in existential risks are global public goods [13] and may therefore be undersupplied by the market [14]. Existential risks are a menace for everybody and may require acting on the international plane. Respect for national sovereignty is not a legitimate excuse for failing to take countermeasures against a major existential risk. If we take into account the welfare of future generations, the harm done by existential risks is multiplied by another factor, the size of which depends on whether and how much we discount future benefits [15,16].

#### Representational violence DOESN’T preclude the need for concrete action

Richard Rorty, Professor of Humanities, University of Virginia, Truth, Politics, and Postmodernism, Spinoza Lectures, 97, p. 51-2

This distinction between the theoretical and the practical point of view is often drawn by Derrida, another writer who enjoys demonstrating that something very important – meaning, for example, or justice, or friendship – is both necessary and impossible. When asked about the implications of these paradoxical fact, Derrida usually replies that the paradox doesn't matter when it comes to practice. More generally, a lot of the writers who are labeled `post‑modernist; and who talk a lot about impossibility, turn out to be good experimentalist social democrats when it comes to actual political activity. I suspect, for example, that Gray, Zizek, Derrida and I, if we found ourselves citizens of the same country, would all be voting for the same candidates, and supporting the same reforms. Post‑modernist philosophers have gotten a bad name because of their paradox‑mongering habits, and their constant use of terms like `impossible; `self‑contradictory' and `unrepresentable'. They have helped create a cult of inscrutability, one which defines itself by opposition to the Enlightenment search for transparency ‑ and more generally, to the `metaphysics of presence; the idea that intellectual progress aims at getting things clearly illuminated, sharply delimited, wholly visible. I am all for getting rid of the metaphysics of presence, but I think that the rhetoric of impossibility and unrepresentability is counterproductive overdramatization. It is one thing to say that we need to get rid of the metaphor of things being accurately represented, once and for all, as a result of being bathed in the light of reason. This metaphor has created a lot of headaches for philosophers, and we would be better off without it. But that does not show that we are suddenly surrounded by unrepresentables; it just shows that `more accurate representation' was never a fruitful way to describe intellectual progress. Even if we agree that we shall never have what Derrida calls "a full presence beyond the reach of play"; our sense of the possibilities open to humanity will not have changed. We have learned nothing about the limits of human hope from metaphysics, or from the philosophy of history, or from psychoanalysis. All that we have learned from `post‑modern' philosophy is that we may need a different gloss on the notion of `progress' than the rationalistic gloss which the Enlightenment offered. We have been given no reason to abandon the belief that a lot of progress has been made by carrying out the Enlightenment's political program. Since Darwin we have come to suspect that whether such progress is made will be largely a matter of luck. But we have been given no reason to stop hoping to get lucky.

#### C) Militarism

#### 1. Other considerations check adventurism – diplomatic and political costs

Time 12

“Betting Against a Drone Arms Race”, Joseph Singh is a researcher at the Center for a New American Security, 8/13/12, http://nation.time.com/2012/08/13/betting-against-a-drone-arms-race/ //jchen

Significant public support for the Obama Administration’s increasing deployment of drones would also seem to legitimate this claim. Yet, there remain equally serious diplomatic and political costs that emanate from beyond a fickle electorate, which will prevent the likes of the increased drone aggression predicted by both Ignatieff and Sharkey.

Most recently, the serious diplomatic scuffle instigated by Syria’s downing a Turkish reconnaissance plane in June illustrated the very serious risks of operating any aircraft in foreign territory.

States launching drones must still weigh the diplomatic and political costs of their actions, which make the calculation surrounding their use no fundamentally different to any other aerial engagement.

#### 2. Lack of drones didn’t restrain conflicts in the past

Goure 12

Daniel Goure, Vice President of the Lexington Institute, a thinktank based in Arlington, Virginia, and an analyst on national security and military issues for NBC, 1/13/12, “Drones and the Changing Nature of Warfare: Hold the Presses!”, http://www.cato-unbound.org/2012/01/13/daniel-goure/drones-changing-nature-warfare-hold-presses //jchen

Armed drones serve a niche function. They are useful in situations where real-time tactical intelligence is required in order to launch a weapon and the operating environment is extremely benign. Because they can loiter in the area of a suspected target, waiting for positive identification and the proper time to strike with the least possibility of inflicting collateral damage, they are far less lethal than any other aerial weapons system.

Attempts to connect an increased tendency to use force are supported neither by the evidence nor by logic. The frequency and intensity of conflicts has declined even as the ability to conduct remote combat has increased exponentially. There were only a handful of drones available to the U.S. military when Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom began. The lack of unmanned systems appears to have posed no obstacle to the decision to initiate either operation.

It is difficult to accord any serious influence over the conduct of air operations in past or current conflicts to the presence of armed drones. In the era before drones, the U.S. imposed ten year long no-fly zones over northern and southern Iraq. In addition, the number of drone sorties in total is but a tiny fraction of all aerial sorties. Armed drone sorties constitute only a small fraction of total drone missions. Cortright notes that since 2009 there have been 239 drone strikes into Pakistan. However, for the month of January 2011, Coalition forces in Afghanistan flew 387 sorties in which guns were fired or munitions expended.[2] These statistics suggest a clear preference on the part of the military for manned aerial systems and not drones in the conduct of tactical air operations.

I might go even farther than Goldstein and argue that Cortright should advocate the greater use of drones, armed and otherwise, precisely due to his interest in reducing the frequency, intensity, and costs of conflicts. Just as dash cameras in police cars and cell phone cameras have led to a decrease in police brutality and the ability to bring those who violate procedures to account, the electro-optical sensors on drones can be used to increase oversight over military forces in the field. In fact, cameras can reduce what Cortright calls “the psychological distance that separates the launching of a strike from its bloody impact.” It can also help reduce the alleged isolation of the American people from the use of force in their name.

#### 3. Public backlash over civilian deaths prevent adventurism – survey proves

Walsh 12

James Igoe Walsh, political science professor at UNC-Charlotte, “Do Drones Change Americans’ Views on the Use of Force?”, 8/28/12, http://themonkeycage.org/2012/08/28/do-drones-change-americans-views-on-the-use-of-force/ //jchen

The treatment describing military casualties leads to a lower level of mean support for the use of force. The chance to avoid military casualties by using drones rather than soldiers produces a noticeable increase in willingness to use force, consistent with the arguments of Mueller and Singer. Finally, the possibility of civilian casualties leads to the largest drop in mean support compared to be baseline treatment. This is a real surprise, since it means that respondents attach as much or more value on the lives of foreign civilians as they do on US military personnel.

It would be unwise to assume that these findings directly reflect the preferences of the American public, since they survey is not based on a random sample. It is, though, reasonable to conclude that the effects of varying the information provided to respondents here would produce qualitatively similar effects in a more representative sample. It is also possible that these relationships would be quite different if what Bruce Jentleson terms the “principal policy objective” where altered from drone strikes to counter terrorists to using drones to, for example, punish abusers of human rights or to bring about regime change overseas.

These results suggest that drones may well alter how Americans think about using military force. The effect of military casualties found here implies that drone technology could make it much easier, and perhaps tempting, for Presidents to use them in conflicts overseas. The smaller effect of mission success means that even the prospect of failure may serve as only a small brake on such impulses. Civilian deaths, though, may well moderate support for drone strikes.

#### 4. Drones still require boots on the ground – checks aggression

Anderson 12

Kenneth Anderson, law professor at Washington College of Law, American University, a research fellow of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, a Non-Resident Visiting Fellow at the Brookings Institution, “Efficiency in bello and ad bellum: Making the Use of Force too Easy?” published in Targeted Killings: Law and Morality in an Asymmetrical World, 4/30/12 //jchen

One last background observation on the nature of targeted killing through drone warfare. Beyond technology, success in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and anywhere beyond, depends crucially upon on-the-ground intelligence long before any Predator is launched. It is an underappreciated point – very underappreciated. The United States has invested many years in the past decade of war in Afghanistan in establishing its own intelligence network on the ground that is able to supply information with respect to both counterinsurgency operations on both sides of the border, as well as with counterterrorism activities and targeting inside Pakistan. This has taken years, and, particularly during the past five years, the CIA has been the lead agency. This is a reason why the CIA, rather than the military, is tasked with much of the drone use in the border areas of Pakistan; it has the intelligence networks. This is also a source of irritation to the Pakistani government, which is no longer able to steer US targeting and intelligence activities.

But the precision of strikes with respect to civilian casualties, and also the ability to determine who the United States should target and ensure that this is the person actually being targeted by a drone, is a function of the CIA’s intelligence capabilities on the ground, integrating a human network together with signals intelligence. This was the background that led to the successful bin Laden raid in 2011 – and a key source of the Pakistani government’s chagrin, that the United State sdid not need it and would possibly have been compromised in the operation. It is also instructive to compare the difficulties of the Libya air campaign, even with weaponized drone aircraft, with the U.S. capabilities in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The mere fact of drone technology in Libya helped targeting considerably, in the actual moment of fighting, but simply having drone capability could not make up for a lack of ground-level intelligence networks. Afghanistan, by contrast, after 10 years of high-technology war, is one of the most thoroughly mapped spaces in the world, ironically, even as it remains one of the least governable – mapped in natural, built, and social terms with respect to targeting and selection of least harmful weapons systems, as Gregory McNeal has observed.

Ground-level intelligence operations are a vital part of making precision weapons precise; drone technology cannot make up for that capability, just as reliance upon pure signals intelligence is insufficient to direct targeting. All must be integrated. The drone is the sharp tip of a spear. But behind the sharp tip is the thin tail (to employ mixed metaphors) of intelligence operations that constitute the bulk of activities. Drones are only as useful as their supporting intelligence, and the only kind that works over the long run, as Libya teaches in one direction and Afghanistan in the other, are dense ground-level networks of human intelligence integrated with signals intelligence and long-running drone surveillance.

What this points to, however, is that a view of drone warfare sometimes offered, of roving drones that observe from the sky, gather information, and then attack – globally roving birds of prey, so to speak – is simply wrong. A large part of this is intelligence required for useful and accurate targeting. But drones also require infrastructure – runways, bases, repair and maintenance, refueling, and the personnel to support all of that. The fact that they might be piloted from the United States does not change the very considerable physical infrastructure required to support them, relatively close to actual operations and, of course, not in Nevada or Langley. Drones are better understood, though not as “global,” but instead as aircraft flown from, but finally tethered to, a (metaphorical) aircraft carrier – roving with a certain range, but always strictly tethered and entirely dependent upon a base. Far from being free-roving global birds of prey, they are instead the last kinetic step in a long, dense, and intensely local intelligence and infrastructure operation.

#### 5) Militarism is inevitable – inherent in the international system.

**MEARSHEIMER 2001**

[John, Co-Director of IR Policy at University of Chicago and Former research fellow at the Brookings institute, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, pg xi-xii. )

The twentieth century was a period of great international violence.In World War I (1914-18), roughly nine million people died on European battlefields. About fifty million people were killed duringWorld War 11(1939-45), well over half of them civilians. Soon after the end of World War II, the Cold War engulfed the globe. During this con-frontation, the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies never directly fought the United States and its North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies,but many millions died in proxy wars in Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola, El Salvador, and elsewhere. Millions also died in the century's lesser, yet still fierce, wars, including the Russo-Japanese con-flicts of 1904-5 and 1939, the Allied intervention in the Russian Civil War from 1918 to 1920, the Russo-Polish War of 1920-21, the various Arab-Israeli wars, and the han-Iraq War of 1980-88. This cycle of violence will continue far into the new millennium. Hopes for peace will probably not be realized, because the great powers that shape the international system fear each other and compete for power as a result. Indeed, their ultimate aim is to gain a position of dominant power over others, because having dominant power is the best means to ensure one's own survival. Strength ensures safety, and the greatest strength is the greatest insurance of safety. States facing this incentive are fated to clash as each competes for advantage over the others. This is a tragic situation, but there is no escaping it unless the states that make up the system agree to form a world government. Such a vast transformation is hardly a realistic prospect, however, so conflict and war are bound to continue as large and enduring features of world politics.

#### No Nuclear War

#### 1. Presidential decisionmaking.

Thomas C. Schelling, Badass/Nobel Laureate – Prof. @ University of Maryland, ‘6 [The Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons: Prospects for Continuance, http://www.cfr.org/publication/10317/]

I’m going to take that as two questions. The first one is the taboo so strong we don’t need the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I think it’s not quite that strong. But I used to argue—a lot of my friends and colleagues thought the United States should participate in a non-first-use declaration, or even a non-first-use treaty. And my argument against it was any U.S. president would be so inhibited about using nuclear weapons in any contingency that no treaty would be any more than adding a hemp rope to an anchor chain. The inhibition is as strong as it could be, and no declarations unilaterally, no treaties, no nothing could make it stronger.

#### ---------2. Nuclear taboo.

Nina Tannenwald, Ph.D. (IR), scholar at the Watson Institute, 1999. [International Organization, The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use ]

A second anomaly emerges when we turn the question around and ask why nuclear weapons, supposedly fearsome deterrent weapons, have not deterred attacks by nonnuclear states against nuclear states. China attacked U.S. forces in the Korean War, North Vietnam attacked U.S. forces in the Vietnam War, Argentina attacked Britain in the Falklands in 1982, and Iraq attacked U.S. forces and Israel in the 1991 Persian Gulf War. Knowledge of a widespread normative opprobrium against nuclear use may have strengthened expectations of non-nuclear states that nuclearweapons would not be used against them. A third anomaly is that, as Harald Mueller has pointed out, the security situation of small, non-nuclear states has not been rendered as perilous in the nuclear age as a realist picture of a predatory anarchy would predict, even though they are completely defenseless against nuclear attack and could not retaliate in kind.2 Most non-nuclear states do not live daily in a nuclear security dilemma. Finally, if deterrence is all that matters, then why have so many states not developed nuclear weapons when they could have done so? Realist arguments that U.S. security guarantees extend the U.S. nuclear umbrella to these non-nuclear states are inadequate, since some of these non-nuclear (but nuclear-capable) states lack U.S. guarantees. I argue that these patterns cannot be accounted for without taking into account the development of a normative prohibition against nuclear weapons. This norm is essential to explaining why nuclear weapons have remained unused and to accounting for their special status as ‘‘taboo’’ weapons.4 Its effect has been to delegitimize nuclear weapons as weapons of war and to embed deterrence practices in a set of norms (regulatory and constitutive)that stabilize and restrain the self-help behavior of states. The larger issue is how conventions (norms, taboos) affect military capabilities and thus the practice of self-help in the international system.5

#### Drones lower the acceptable collateral damage and increase restrictive rules of engagement

Beard 09

Jack Beard, Professorial Lecturer, UCLA School of Law; former Associate Deputy General Counsel (International Affairs), Department of Defense. The author was also assigned as a Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve to the International and Operational Law Division, Office of The Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, Vol. 103:409, 2009, LAW AND WAR IN THE VIRTUAL ERA, http://www.asil.org/ajil/July2009\_1selectedpiece.pdf //jchen

The effects of these rising public expectations and greater levels of transparency are unfolding as the new virtual surveillance systems are being widely deployed for the first time in history. While this process continues, lawyers, attack planners, and military commanders are grappling with their new responsibilities. One measure of these developments that also reflects how the war-fighting bureaucracy of a powerful state like the United States comes to terms with the grim prospect of civilian deaths, political pressures, legal constraints, and the ever-increasing scrutiny of a legalized and humanized international society is a set of documents referred to as “Rules of Engagement.”55 It is here that key policy, legal, and operational interests are balanced and many important targeting restrictions are established.56 Lawyers already play a prominent part in the development of these rules,57 but the increasing transparency of military operations made possible by virtual technologies and the likelihood that more military operations will ulti- mately have to be explained and defended will further elevate their role and the level of scrutiny they may apply. Even now, lawyers, in advising attack planners, often take a broad view of potential humanitarian considerations and propose restraints on operations that go far beyond more permissive rules of engagement.58 These restrictions have sometimes constrained U.S. forces in ways that enemy action could not have done, particularly when public opinion has been a crucial factor.59

Aside from parts of rules of engagement that may be classified, their publicly available con- tents over the last several years serve as a barometer of progressively rising constraints on U.S. military operations imposed by social, political, diplomatic, and legal pressures.60 Virtual tech- nologies are both enlarging the role of lawyers and accelerating a process in which restrictive interpretations of the law of war may be becoming the minimum acceptable standard in the rules for attacks that risk civilian damage and injury. The capability provided by virtual tech- nology to strike more targets and perform more missions thus comes at an unexpected and, for some military leaders, highly problematic cost: some of the most restrictive air-strike protocols and rules of engagement of all time.61 These developments are also fundamentally linked to the contribution that the informational capabilities of virtual technologies are making to the con- temporary concept of what constitutes victory in modern counterinsurgency operations.

Drones avoid the romanticization of war, violence can only be justified because of its necessity not for glory. Drones face increased scrutiny that means fewer civilians die.

Brennan 13

Kiel Brennan-Marquez is a Visiting Human Rights Fellow at Yale Law School, “A progressive defense of drones”, 5/24/13, Salon, http://www.salon.com/2013/05/24/a\_progressive\_defense\_of\_drones/ //jchen

But there is another moral dimension to drone warfare, running in the opposite direction, which I fear has been lost in the haze of (rightful) outcry. For the same reason that **drone warfare stands to make** **violence** easier to deploy — none of our lives are on the line — it also makes violence **harder to rationalize.** **The pain and death of drone strikes, unlike the pain and death of traditional missions, can draw no comfort from narratives of heroism. Destruction wrought by machines is neither noble nor grand**. It’s asinine, and unfailingly repugnant**. This means that drone strikes must be justified on their own terms, without recourse to war’s long-standing mystification.** **In a world where we apotheosize soldiers, and rope off their actions from everyday opprobrium, it’s important to consider whether the banal violence of machines might be preferable to the lionized violence of men**.

A year ago, Tom Engelhardt published a memorable essay in the Nation on the vileness of drone warfare. Taking a healthily incredulous view of the Obama administration’s assurance that it would use its lurid toy for exclusively virtuous ends, Engelhardt concluded with a flourish of outrage: “What [our leaders] can’t see in the haze of exceptional self-congratulation is this: they are transforming the promise of America into a promise of death. And death, visited from the skies, isn’t precise. It isn’t glorious. It isn’t judicious. It certainly isn’t a shining vision. It’s hell.” Magnificently put: **The only trouble is that these same critiques would apply just as forcefully, if not more so, to traditional warfare. War isn’t precise. It isn’t glorious. It isn’t judicious. It isn’t a shining vision. It’s hell.**

The difference between traditional warfare and drone strikes is that the latter can be clearly identified as hellacious. Not just by poets and philosophers – but by everyone, everywhere, in the immediacy of its horror. When innocent people end up dead as the result of a drone strike, we easily recognize that outcome as morally lamentable. **Undaunted by the symbolic distortion of the battlefield, we confront drones with the skepticism — and, as the case may be, the outrage — that accompanies moral clarity. The burden of proof inverts. Unlike traditional warfare, when the loss of life on the other side is presumptively acceptable, and it only becomes unacceptable if circumstances render it so, in the case of drone strikes, the loss of lives on the other side is presumptively unacceptable**

**,** and **it only becomes acceptable if a persuasive rationale can be offered.** Such rationales are not impossible to formulate, but it faces a steep upward grade. It’s an argument of last resort, defensive rather than triumphant.

#### Reducing the risk increases the standard for proportionality

Beard 09

Jack Beard, Professorial Lecturer, UCLA School of Law; former Associate Deputy General Counsel (International Affairs), Department of Defense. The author was also assigned as a Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve to the International and Operational Law Division, Office of The Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, Vol. 103:409, 2009, LAW AND WAR IN THE VIRTUAL ERA, http://www.asil.org/ajil/July2009\_1selectedpiece.pdf //jchen

Virtual Distance: Giving Proportionality Traction

**The obligation to refrain from disproportionate attacks often forces military commanders to make difficult decisions, to weigh the value of innocent human lives in relation to the capture or destruction of a particular military objective**. While the proportionality test is unquestion- ably applicable to modern military operations—and failure by a commander to comply with obligations derived from proportionality can constitute a war crime100—the test is much easier to formulate in principle than to apply to a complex or uncertain set of circumstances. As a result, military commanders and states have enjoyed a great deal of discretion in making these evaluations. However, **various aspects of the distance of virtual technologies from the battle- field dramatically change factors that previously were critical to such evaluations**. **This new “virtual” distance is giving proportionality requirements new significance by eliminating some of the key excuses that states have long used to escape responsibility for attacks that appear to cause excessive civilian casualties.**

Risk. In examining and reviewing charges that NATO attacks on targets during the 1999 Kosovo conflict were unlawful, a committee established for that purpose within the Office of the Prosecutor for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY Committee)101 concluded that once it is decided that the proportionality principle applies, certain key questions must be resolved. These questions include the relative values to be assigned to the military advantage to be gained and the possible injury to noncombatants and/or the damage to civilian objects; the information to be included or excluded in totaling sums; and the “standard of measurement in time or space.”102 As difficult as these first three questions are, the committee added an important fourth one: “To what extent is a military commander obligated to expose his own forces to danger in order to limit civilian casualties or damage to civilian objects?”103 In the context of conventional manned aircraft, exposure is often linked to the altitude at which aircraft must fly to launch attacks safely and avoid hostile ground fire.

To what extent a military commander should expose his forces to danger to minimize col- lateral damage is likely to be seen much differently by a military officer responsible for the well-being of his troops than by a human rights expert working at a nongovernmental orga- nization. For example, human rights groups criticized the U.S. high-altitude bombing of Iraqi targets in the 1991Gulf war as having diminished bombing accuracy and unnecessarily endangering civilians.104 The U.S. Defense Department, however, maintained that coalition forces had taken many steps to “provide the greatest possible accuracy and the least risk to civil- ian objects and the civilian population”—but explained that it had taken only those measures that could be implemented “[t]o the degree possible and consistent with allowable risk to air- craft and aircrews.”105

The issue of the greater risks that high-altitude bombing may pose to civilians arose again during the Kosovo conflict when human rights groups complained that NATO gave priority to protecting its pilots rather than civilians.106 In addressing these charges, the ICTY Com- mittee noted that “NATO air commanders have a duty to take practicable measures to dis- tinguish military objectives from civilians or civilian objectives,” but nonetheless found that there was “nothing inherently unlawful about flying above the height which can be reached by enemy air defences.”107 While noting that the fifteen-thousand-foot minimum altitude adopted by NATO for a significant part of its air campaign meant that a target “could not be verified with the naked eye,” the committee believed that modern technology allowed NATO to meet its obligation to distinguish “in the vast majority of cases during the bombing cam- paign.”108 Even though the safety of aircrews remains a compelling objective, such reasoning has enabled states with high-altitude bombing capabilities to avoid a fuller application of pro- portionality requirements to many of their aerial bombing operations.

# 2NC

## Conventional Shift

#### Better than the alternatives – operation defensive shield, invasions

Statman 04

Daniel Statman, Professor of philosophy at the University of Haifa in Israel and author of the books Moral Dilemmas and Religion and Morality, “Targeted Killing”, Theoretical Inquiries in Law, Vol 5: 179, 2004, https://www.law.upenn.edu/institutes/cerl/conferences/targetedkilling/papers/StatmanTargetedKilling.pdf //jchen

The moral legitimacy of targeted killing becomes even clearer when compared to the alternative means of fighting terror—that is, the massive invasion of the community that shelters and supports the terrorists in an attempt to catch or kill the terrorists and destroy their infrastructure. This mode of operation was adopted, for example, by the U.S. and Britain in Afghanistan and by Israel in its “Operation Defensive Shield” carried out after the terrorist Passover massacre in March 2002. While many claim this method to be morally preferable to targeted killing—likely because it bears more of a resemblance to “real” war—I believe the opposite to be true. First, invading a civilian area inevitably leads to the deaths and injury of far more people, mostly innocent people, than careful use of targeted killing. Second, such actions bring death, misery, and destruction to people who are only minimally involved (if at all) in, or responsible for, terror or military attacks, whereas with targeted killing, collateral damage is significantly reduced (though not prevented altogether). Hence, targeted killing is the preferable method not only because, on a utilitarian calculation, it saves lives—a very weighty moral consideration—but also because it is more commensurate with a fundamental condition of justified self-defense, namely, that those killed are responsible for the threat posed. Members of the Hammas in Gaza are far more responsible for the threat of terror to Israel than their non-activist neighbors are; hence it is preferable from a moral standpoint to target the former directly rather than invade Gaza and inevitably cause great injury to the latter and general population.

#### Alternatives increase local resentment – cruise missiles and bombers more unpopular

Etzioni 10

Amitai Etzioni, University Professor and Professor of International Relations at The George Washington University, “Unmanned Aircraft Systems: The Moral and Legal Case”, National Defense University, Joint Force Quarterly, JFQ issue 57, 2010 p66 //jchen

Do UAS Alienate Populations? Prudential arguments against the use of UAS are that they antagonize the population, create martyrs, invite retaliatory attacks, entail the loss of moral high ground, and undermine the legitimacy of the local government (for cooperating with Americans). All this may be true, but the same holds for other means of warfare. Using bombers often generates even more collateral damage and resentment. Attacks by Special Forces are considered more alienating than strikes by UAS because they entail a blatant violation of sovereignty. Nor are there necessarily fewer mistaken targets or less collateral damage when Special Forces or regular forces are used. Last but not least, important segments of the population resent the presence of foreign troops—and the governments they support— for a variety of sentimental, cultural, religious, and nationalistic reasons. No wonder that in areas and periods in which the use of UAS was scaled back, there was no noticeable change in the attitudes of the population.

#### Resentment’s not unique to drones – hate cruise missiles and bombs

Etzioni 13

Amitai Etzioni, professor of international relations at George Washington University and author of Hot Spots: American Foreign Pol- icy in a Post-Human-Rights World, 4/30/13, “Drones: Say it with figures”, http://www.upi.com/Top\_News/Analysis/Outside-View/2013/04/30/Outside-View-Drones-Say-it-with-figures/UPI-25571367294880/ //jchen

It is also worth noting that these critics attribute resentment to drones rather than military strikes.

Do they really think that resentment would be lower if the United States were using cruise missiles? Or bombers? Or Special Forces?

#### Ending drones doesn’t end counterterrorism policy

Washington Post 11

Washington Post, Greg Miller, 12/27/11, “Under Obama, an emerging global apparatus for drone killing”//jchen

Inside the White House, according to officials who would discuss the drone program only on the condition of anonymity, the drone is seen as a critical tool whose evolution was accelerating even before Obama was elected. Senior administration officials said the escalating number of strikes has created a perception that the drone is driving counterterrorism policy, when the reverse is true.

“People think we start with the drone and go from there, but that’s not it at all,” said a senior administration official involved with the program. “We’re not constructing a campaign around the drone. We’re not seeking to create some worldwide basing network so we have drone capabilities in every corner of the globe.”

#### Counterterrorism policy inevitable – entrenched in American social structure

Jackson 11

Richard Jackson, Professor of International Politics, Aberystwyth University, UK. He received his PhD in international conflict resolution from the University of Canterbury, “Culture, identity and hegemony: Continuity and (the lack of) change in US counterterrorism policy from Bush to Obama”, International Politics (2011) 48, 390–411. doi:10.1057/ip.2011.5, http://www.palgrave-journals.com/ip/journal/v48/n2/full/ip20115a.html //jchen

This article draws broadly upon these theoretical approaches in analysing the construction of US counterterrorism policy since September 2001. It attempts to make a fairly obvious but nonetheless important set of arguments: the war on terror, like the cold war and other militarised interventions before it, has become institutionalised and normalised in policy practices and institutions, as well as in American culture; it has in the years since 9/11 become a powerful social structure (a hegemonic discourse) that both expresses and simultaneously co-constructs US interests and identity. For this reason, and on the evidence of President Obama's language and policy proposals to date, the war on terror will continue with only minor changes in form and practice into the foreseeable future. In consequence, it attempts to argue that, not only are there far more continuities than differences in counterterrorism policy between the Bush and Obama administrations, but the possibilities for significant policy changes, barring major unforeseen events which create a crisis or moment of rupture, are highly constrained at the present juncture.

#### Cruise missiles empirically bad – huge casualty amounts

Wessler 12

Nathan Freed Wessler, Fellow, ACLU, and Pardiss Kebriaei, Attorney, Center for Constitutional Rights, “Seeking the Truth About U.S. Targeted Killing Strike That Killed Dozens of Women and Children in Yemen”, 4/17/12, https://www.aclu.org/blog/national-security/seeking-truth-about-us-targeted-killing-strike-killed-dozens-women-and //jchen

Today the ACLU and the Center for Constitutional Rights filed a Freedom of Information Act request seeking information about a horrific U.S. missile strike that killed dozens of civilians in Yemen.

This was the Obama administration's first known missile strike in Yemen, carried out with one or more cruise missiles launched from an American warship or submarine on December 17, 2009. The U.S. military reportedly used cluster bombs, killing at least 41 people in the remote mountain village of al-Majalah in Yemen's Abyan province. The government was purportedly targeting "militants," but those killed include at least 21 children and 14 women. Entire families were wiped out. It is the worst reported loss of civilian life from a U.S. targeted killing strike in Yemen to date.

#### Drones minimize casualties – cruise missiles don’t

Koenig 13

Robert Koenig, 5/1/13, reporter, “Drone wars: Do 'targeted killings' undermine 'hearts and minds' counterterrorism efforts?”, https://www.stlbeacon.org/#!/content/30654/drone\_wars\_durbin //jchen

 But the use of “remotely piloted aircraft” (the Pentagon’s preferred term for drones) had its defenders as a military tactic. Retired Air Force Col. Martha McSally, who led the military oversight and planning for RPAs in Africa from July 2007 to April 2010, explained in her testimony why the weapons are often preferable to sending in bombers or cruise missiles.

"Once a decision has been made that it is legal and wise strategy to conduct a targeted strike, the RPA platform is usually the hands-down best choice to maximize precision, persistent intelligence, responsiveness, and oversight by commanders/intelligence experts/legal experts," McSally said.

"It also has the benefit of minimizing civilian casualties at with risk of U.S. casualties and at relatively low cost."

#### Statistics disprove blowback

Johnston 12

Patrick B. Johnston, Associate Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation. He wrote this article while he was a fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation and the Empirical Studies of Conflict Project at Stanford University and at the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, “Does Decapitation Work? Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership Targeting in Counterinsurgency Campaigns”, International Security, Vol. 36, No. 4 (Spring 2012), pp. 47–79 //jchen

The results strongly suggest that successful leadership removals, not blowback from failed attempts, drive the overall effect of leadership decapitation. The results are displayed in table 5. For both successful and unsuccessful decapitation attempts, the results are similar across the matched and unmatched samples and are robust to the inclusion of axed effects and controls. Confidence in the findings is enhanced by the fact that the point estimates for successful leadership removals shown in table 5 are consistent with those displayed in table 3, which used exogenous variation in attempt outcomes to examine whether the correlation between successful attempts and campaign termination and government victory differed from the correlations between failed attempts and those outcomes. Specifically, the estimated effect of successful decapitation attempts remains similar in size to the estimates shown in table 3. The coefficients presented in table 5 suggest that leadership decapitation is associated with a 28-percentage point increase in the probability of termination during the year in which the decapitation attempt occurred and a 29or 30-percentage point increase in the probability of government victory. Both of these results are significant at the 1 percent level.

There is little evidence of a “blowback effect.” As the blowback hypothesis would predict, the point estimates for failed attempts are negative, which indicates that failed attempts to capture or kill insurgent leaders may have counterproductive effects on governments’ chances of defeating insurgencies.

There is not enough evidence, however, to reject the null hypothesis—that failed decapitation operations have no overall impact on states’ chances of strategic success. Indeed, the estimated effect of failed attempts is small and far from statistically significant, with p-values that range from 0.356 to 0.788. Taken together, this evidence strongly indicates that the successful removal of insurgent leaders, not blowback from failed attempts, underlies my key findings on the effects of leadership decapitation in counterinsurgency operations.

#### No backlash in Yemen

Axe 12

David Axe, American military correspondent who writes on military life and aspects of current conflicts, 8/13/12, “Hidden History: America’s Secret Drone War in Africa”, http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2012/08/somalia-drones/all/ //jchen

In other countries, however , attitudes might be different. This spring, University of Virginia researcher Chris Swift spent a week interviewing tribal leaders in southern Yemen, another target-rich zone for U.S. drones. Swift found that war-weary rural populations were ambivalent about robot strikes. “Nobody in my cohort [of interview subjects] drew a causal link between drones on one hand and [militant] recruiting on other,” Swift said.

#### Yemen public is more tolerant of drone strikes – resentment decreasing

Terrill 13

W. Andrew Terrill, Strategic Studies Institute, SSI’s Middle East specialist, served as a Middle East nonproliferation analyst for the Inter- national Assessments Division of the Lawrence Liver- more National Laboratory, PhD in international relations from Claremont, “The Struggle for Yemen and the Challenge of Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula”, June 2013 //jchen

Hadi’s decision to acknowledge the U.S. use of drones in the struggle against AQAP drew a mixed response in Yemen. Some Yemenis appeared to appre- ciate that he was more open than Saleh and saw his honesty as a break from the past.219 While drone strikes remain highly controversial in Yemen, the Yemeni public also seems to have become somewhat more tol- erant of U.S. drone use over the last year than it was over earlier incidents. This change may be because the internal situation became more alarming, due to the rise of Ansar al-Shariah and the ability of these forces to take and hold a number of Yemeni towns and small cities throughout the Abyan and Shabwa provinces. Yet, even Yemenis who detest AQAP have been quick to maintain that innocent people have been acciden- tally killed by drones and that, at the very least, “tough limitations” must be imposed on such systems if they are to be used.220 This situation will be difficult for the United States, since any serious mistake regarding collateral damage from drones could produce a domestic backlash which Yemeni politicians would be reluctant to ignore.221 Moreover, a variety of powerful Yemeni politicians, including the radical Sunni cleric Abdul- Majeed al-Zindani, have sharply criticized the use of drones in Yemen and stand ready to take political ad- vantage from any future incidents of collateral dam- age.222 Such politicians will almost certainly exaggerate the number of innocents killed in strikes that involve civilian deaths.

#### Reducing the risk increases the standard for proportionality

Beard 09

Jack Beard, Professorial Lecturer, UCLA School of Law; former Associate Deputy General Counsel (International Affairs), Department of Defense. The author was also assigned as a Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve to the International and Operational Law Division, Office of The Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, Vol. 103:409, 2009, LAW AND WAR IN THE VIRTUAL ERA, http://www.asil.org/ajil/July2009\_1selectedpiece.pdf //jchen

Virtual Distance: Giving Proportionality Traction

**The obligation to refrain from disproportionate attacks often forces military commanders to make difficult decisions, to weigh the value of innocent human lives in relation to the capture or destruction of a particular military objective**. While the proportionality test is unquestion- ably applicable to modern military operations—and failure by a commander to comply with obligations derived from proportionality can constitute a war crime100—the test is much easier to formulate in principle than to apply to a complex or uncertain set of circumstances. As a result, military commanders and states have enjoyed a great deal of discretion in making these evaluations. However, **various aspects of the distance of virtual technologies from the battle- field dramatically change factors that previously were critical to such evaluations**. **This new “virtual” distance is giving proportionality requirements new significance by eliminating some of the key excuses that states have long used to escape responsibility for attacks that appear to cause excessive civilian casualties.**

Risk. In examining and reviewing charges that NATO attacks on targets during the 1999 Kosovo conflict were unlawful, a committee established for that purpose within the Office of the Prosecutor for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY Committee)101 concluded that once it is decided that the proportionality principle applies, certain key questions must be resolved. These questions include the relative values to be assigned to the military advantage to be gained and the possible injury to noncombatants and/or the damage to civilian objects; the information to be included or excluded in totaling sums; and the “standard of measurement in time or space.”102 As difficult as these first three questions are, the committee added an important fourth one: “To what extent is a military commander obligated to expose his own forces to danger in order to limit civilian casualties or damage to civilian objects?”103 In the context of conventional manned aircraft, exposure is often linked to the altitude at which aircraft must fly to launch attacks safely and avoid hostile ground fire.

To what extent a military commander should expose his forces to danger to minimize col- lateral damage is likely to be seen much differently by a military officer responsible for the well-being of his troops than by a human rights expert working at a nongovernmental orga- nization. For example, human rights groups criticized the U.S. high-altitude bombing of Iraqi targets in the 1991Gulf war as having diminished bombing accuracy and unnecessarily endangering civilians.104 The U.S. Defense Department, however, maintained that coalition forces had taken many steps to “provide the greatest possible accuracy and the least risk to civil- ian objects and the civilian population”—but explained that it had taken only those measures that could be implemented “[t]o the degree possible and consistent with allowable risk to air- craft and aircrews.”105

The issue of the greater risks that high-altitude bombing may pose to civilians arose again during the Kosovo conflict when human rights groups complained that NATO gave priority to protecting its pilots rather than civilians.106 In addressing these charges, the ICTY Com- mittee noted that “NATO air commanders have a duty to take practicable measures to dis- tinguish military objectives from civilians or civilian objectives,” but nonetheless found that there was “nothing inherently unlawful about flying above the height which can be reached by enemy air defences.”107 While noting that the fifteen-thousand-foot minimum altitude adopted by NATO for a significant part of its air campaign meant that a target “could not be verified with the naked eye,” the committee believed that modern technology allowed NATO to meet its obligation to distinguish “in the vast majority of cases during the bombing cam- paign.”108 Even though the safety of aircrews remains a compelling objective, such reasoning has enabled states with high-altitude bombing capabilities to avoid a fuller application of pro- portionality requirements to many of their aerial bombing operations.

#### Video records improve transparency/accountability

Beard 09

Jack Beard, Professorial Lecturer, UCLA School of Law; former Associate Deputy General Counsel (International Affairs), Department of Defense. The author was also assigned as a Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve to the International and Operational Law Division, Office of The Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, Vol. 103:409, 2009, LAW AND WAR IN THE VIRTUAL ERA, http://www.asil.org/ajil/July2009\_1selectedpiece.pdf //jchen

While the content of new virtually provided information has important ramifications, the possible presence of such data also has profound and unintended consequences. These consequences extend to activities before, during, and after an attack. The availability of more relevant information entails new responsibilities for obtaining and properly using it in planning an attack. Furthermore, although lawyers and others involved in reviewing or planning attacks might once have accepted many limits on their ability to access potentially relevant data, the network-centric intelligence systems spawned by new virtual operational requirements will presumably raise not only the accessibility of such data, but also the expectation of receiving it throughout the military structure. Prior to authorizing an attack, lawyers, planners, and commanders nowadays must consider the unprecedented new video record that may be created, especially if an attack risks harm to civilians and is likely to be scrutinized later. During the operation, the possibility that an attack may need to be suspended because of changes in the attack scenario (including the sudden detection of civilians at or near the target) will be dramatically increased by the same virtual surveillance that makes the attack itself possible. Pilots and aircrews are not immune from concerns in this area, since their actions may be recorded by the same intelligence assets used to facilitate their targeting.51

After an attack, virtual technologies are making many military operations more transparent by radically expanding a process that began in earnest during the 1991 Gulf war when U.S. officials first showed video footage of attacks from the bomb cameras on PGMs. Since only a small fraction of the bombs used in the Gulf war were actually PGMs, the selected bomb-cam- era video footage was shown at Defense Department briefings for demonstration and publicity purposes. This situation started to change in 1999 during the NATO confrontation with Ser- bia over Kosovo, as American officials struggled to explain the basis for specific controversial attacks and to account for collateral bomb damage. Facing intense criticism by human rights groups and the Serbian government, U.S. and NATO officials attempted to rebut allegations of misconduct by any means available, which led them to apply existing technological capa- bilities in unintended ways by systematically using bomb-camera videos to support their counterarguments.52

At international briefings since the Kosovo conflict, U.S. officials have increasingly dis- played videos and other imagery to document their version of attacks, alleged enemy actions, and various other incidents. For example, U.S. officials recently used videos to help make their case with respect to an alleged Iranian provocation of a U.S. warship in the Straits of Hormuz, the alleged presence of North Korean workers at a reportedly nuclear facility in Syria, and the accidental shooting of twelve Pakistani soldiers allegedly mistaken for Taliban militants in the mountainous region near the Afghan border (as recorded by a UAV flying overhead).53 The introduction of virtual surveillance capabilities dramatically increases the pressure on states to deploy information to rebut accusations of misconduct on the part of their military forces. By failing to come forward with information to support its account of events, a government with such capabilities is more likely than ever to face criticism and inspire doubts about its claims, whether or not such information actually exists. This new level of expected transpar- ency for military operations was embodied in requests by news organizations to the U.S. Air Force for UAV-generated video coverage of various attacks involving U.S. forces in Iraq; these requests were granted and resulted in the posting on Internet news sites of portions of the requested footage.54
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### Extinction First

#### Default to util – extinction outweighs.

Harries, 94 – Editor @ The National Interest (Owen, Power and Civilization, The National Interest, Spring, lexis)

Performance is the test. Asked directly by a Western interviewer, “In principle, do you believe in one standard of human rights and free expression?”, Lee immediately answers, “Look, it is not a matter of principle but of practice.” This might appear to represent a simple and rather crude pragmatism. But in its context it might also be interpreted as an appreciation of the fundamental point made by Max Weber that, in politics, it is “the ethic of responsibility” rather than “the ethic of absolute ends” that is appropriate. While an individual is free to treat human rights as absolute, to be observed whatever the cost, governments must always weigh consequences and the competing claims of other ends. So once they enter the realm of politics, human rights have to take their place in a hierarchy of interests, including such basic things as national security and the promotion of prosperity. Their place in that hierarchy will vary with circumstances, but no responsible government will ever be able to put them always at the top and treat them as inviolable and over-riding. The cost of implementing and promoting them will always have to be considered.

#### Moral absolutism fails.

Isaac, 2 – Professor of Poli Sci @ U Indiana, Bloomington (Jeffrey, Ends, Means and Politics, Dissent, Vol 49, Iss. 2, Spring)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable**,** reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence**,** then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice**.** This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers**.** It promotes arrogance. And it **undermines political effectiveness**.

### Ethics Not First

#### prioritizing ontology is politically disastrous. attention to the abstract problems of ontology means concrete political decisions to avoid fascism appear irrelevant.

Steven B. SMITH Poli Sci @ Yale ‘2 in Confronting Mass Democracy and Industrial Technology ed. John McCormick p. 264-266

Strauss offers two, not necessarily consistent or even fully satisfactory, answers. At times he maintains that Heidegger's embrace of National Socialism was compelled by his radical historicism. Like Heidegger's student Karl Lowith, Strauss maintains that Heidegger's "renunciation of the very notion of eternity" is bound up with his "submission" to the events of 1933, The result of this renunciation was a deferral to a historical fate or destiny that made "discredited democracy [i.e., Weimar] look like the golden age. "14 It was his contempt for "those permanent characteristics of humanity" that led Heidegger to submit to and even endorse "the verdict of the least wise and least moderate part of his nation while it was in its least wise and least moderate mood ."71 But is it correct to conclude that the ideas of Being and Time are inti- mately connected to the ideology of National Socialism? Is it not more accurate to say that while Heidegger's thought did not compel surrender to the events of 1933, it provided no principled grounds for resistance to it?", It seems that Heidegger's account of historical Dasein is at most con- tingently related to his political choices. The problem with Heidegger's philosophy is not that it is intimately tied to any particular polities, but that it is almost **infinitely elastic**, capable of adapting itself to whatever permutation of Dasein happens to come next. Imagine, for example, the following scenario, Had Hitler come to power in Russia and Lenin and the Bolsheviks in Germany, there is no reason to believe that Heidegger could not have just as consistently become a mem- ber of the Communist party. Under different circumstances, it is just as easy to imagine him arguing that Marxism-Leninism is the authentic fate and destiny of the German nation, which must be defended against Anglo- American democracy and Russian Nazism. One can almost hear Heideg- gem saying in a hypothetical moment of self-criticism that Stalin's purges and policies of forced collectivization were themselves the result of a mis- placed "humanism" with its desire to make man the master and possessor of the earth .77 Indeed, Heidegger's politics, such as they are, have proved remarkably susceptible to manipulation for different ends. Segments of the postwar Left found no difficulty turning his strictures against the dom- inance of global technology into a critique of capitalist society, and more recently environmentalists have found in his analysis of produetionist metaphysics an argument for "green" polities and "deep ecology?'78 At another point, Strauss suggests that not historicism as such, but Heidegger's virtually **exclusive concern with Being blinded him to the real facts of tyranny**. His subordination of political philosophy to **fundamental ontology** created its own forms of **moral blindness**. It was Heidegger's own curious "forgetfulness" of politics and the primacy of political philosophy that led him to minimize, if not deny altogether, the atrocities of the Holocaust. For Heidegger, the Holocaust remained fundamentally a con- sequence of technology, not a moral and political problem.79 It was Heidegger's indifference to the moral phenomena that Strauss ultimately finds inexcusable. In the final sentence of his reply to Kojève (at last frilly restored to the English edition), Strauss attacks Heidegger for moral cowardice in the face of tyranny and for lacking the courage to face the consequences of his own philosophy. Here Strauss makes common cause with Kojeve for their close attention to the primacy of the political: But we have been constantly mindful of it [ix., the relation between tyranny and philosophy], for both of us appear to turn our attention away from Being and toward tyranny because we saw that those who lacked the courage to face the consequences of tyranny, who, therefore et humiliter serviebant et superbe dominabantur, were at the same time forced to escape the consequences of Being precisely because they did nothing but speak about Being8° Strauss seems to suggest here that it was Heidegger's concern for Being, rather than beings, that led to his indifference to the fact of tyranny. At issue is the very abstractness of Heidegger's articulation of the problem of Being. The extreme artificiality of regarding human beings under the rubric of an anonymous historical Dasein could not but **anesthetize him to** the **suffering** of actual historical persons. I am not finally convinced that 1-leidegger's Nazi problem is intimately connected to his analysis of Being, but Strauss's critique enables us to see the high price of Heidegger's forget- fulness of the political.

#### Default to util – extinction outweighs.

Harries, 94 – Editor @ The National Interest (Owen, Power and Civilization, The National Interest, Spring, lexis)

Performance is the test. Asked directly by a Western interviewer, “In principle, do you believe in one standard of human rights and free expression?”, Lee immediately answers, “Look, it is not a matter of principle but of practice.” This might appear to represent a simple and rather crude pragmatism. But in its context it might also be interpreted as an appreciation of the fundamental point made by Max Weber that, in politics, it is “the ethic of responsibility” rather than “the ethic of absolute ends” that is appropriate. While an individual is free to treat human rights as absolute, to be observed whatever the cost, governments must always weigh consequences and the competing claims of other ends. So once they enter the realm of politics, human rights have to take their place in a hierarchy of interests, including such basic things as national security and the promotion of prosperity. Their place in that hierarchy will vary with circumstances, but no responsible government will ever be able to put them always at the top and treat them as inviolable and over-riding. The cost of implementing and promoting them will always have to be considered.

#### Moral absolutism fails.

Isaac, 2 – Professor of Poli Sci @ U Indiana, Bloomington (Jeffrey, Ends, Means and Politics, Dissent, Vol 49, Iss. 2, Spring)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable**,** reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence**,** then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice**.** This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers**.** It promotes arrogance. And it **undermines political effectiveness**.

#### Hypothesizing about the complex inner-working of government is key to creating space for critique

David E. McClean, 2001, “The Cultural Left and the Limits of Social Hope,” Am. Phil. Conf., www.american-philosophy.org/archives/past\_conference\_programs/pc2001/Discussion%20papers/david\_mcclean.htm

Yet for some reason, at least partially explicated in Richard Rorty's Achieving Our Country, a book that I think is long overdue, leftist critics continue to cite and refer to the eccentric and often a priori ruminations of people like those just mentioned, and a litany of others including Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, Jameson, and Lacan, who are to me hugely more irrelevant than Habermas in their narrative attempts to suggest policy prescriptions (when they actually do suggest them) aimed at curing the ills of homelessness, poverty, market greed, national belligerence and racism. I would like to suggest that it is time for American social critics who are enamored with this group, those who actually want to be relevant, to recognize that they have a disease, and a disease regarding which I myself must remember to stay faithful to my own twelve step program of recovery. The disease is the need for elaborate theoretical "remedies" wrapped in neological and multi-syllabic jargon. These elaborate theoretical remedies are more "interesting," to be sure, than the pragmatically settled questions about what shape democracy should take in various contexts, or whether private property should be protected by the state, or regarding our basic human nature (described, if not defined (heaven forbid!), in such statements as "We don't like to starve" and "We like to speak our minds without fear of death" and "We like to keep our children safe from poverty"). As Rorty puts it, "When one of today's academic leftists says that some topic has been 'inadequately theorized,' you can be pretty certain that he or she is going to drag in either philosophy of language, or Lacanian psychoanalysis, or some neo-Marxist version of economic determinism. . . . These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations"(italics mine).(1) Or as John Dewey put it in his The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy, "I believe that philosophy in America will be lost between chewing a historical cud long since reduced to woody fiber, or an apologetics for lost causes, . . . . or a scholastic, schematic formalism, unless it can somehow bring to consciousness America's own needs and its own implicit principle of successful action." Those who suffer or have suffered from this disease Rorty refers to as the Cultural Left, which left is juxtaposed to the Political Left that Rorty prefers and prefers for good reason. Another attribute of the Cultural Left is that its members fancy themselves pure culture critics who view the successes of America and the West, rather than some of the barbarous methods for achieving those successes, as mostly evil, and who view anything like national pride as equally evil even when that pride is tempered with the knowledge and admission of the nation's shortcomings. In other words, the Cultural Left, in this country, too often dismiss American society as beyond reform and redemption. And Rorty correctly argues that this is a disastrous conclusion, i.e. disastrous for the Cultural Left. I think it may also be disastrous for our social hopes, as I will explain. Leftist American culture critics might put their considerable talents to better use if they bury some of their cynicism about America's social and political prospects and help forge public and political possibilities in a spirit of determination to, indeed, achieve our country - the country of Jefferson and King; the country of John Dewey and Malcom X; the country of Franklin Roosevelt and Bayard Rustin, and of the later George Wallace and the later Barry Goldwater. To invoke the words of King, and with reference to the American society, the time is always ripe to seize the opportunity to help create the "beloved community," one woven with the thread of agape into a conceptually single yet diverse tapestry that shoots for nothing less than a true intra-American cosmopolitan ethos, one wherein both same sex unions and faith-based initiatives will be able to be part of the same social reality, one wherein business interests and the university are not seen as belonging to two separate galaxies but as part of the same answer to the threat of social and ethical nihilism. We who fancy ourselves philosophers would do well to create from within ourselves and from within our ranks a new kind of public intellectual who has both a hungry theoretical mind and who is yet capable of seeing the need to move past high theory to other important questions that are less bedazzling and "interesting" but more important to the prospect of our flourishing - questions such as "How is it possible to develop a citizenry that cherishes a certain hexis, one which prizes the character of the Samaritan on the road to Jericho almost more than any other?" or "How can we square the political dogma that undergirds the fantasy of a missile defense system with the need to treat America as but one member in a community of nations under a "law of peoples?" The new public philosopher might seek to understand labor law and military and trade theory and doctrine as much as theories of surplus value; the logic of international markets and trade agreements as much as critiques of commodification, and the politics of complexity as much as the politics of power (all of which can still be done from our arm chairs.) This means going down deep into the guts of our quotidian social institutions, into the grimy pragmatic details where intellectuals are loathe to dwell but where the officers and bureaucrats of those institutions take difficult and often unpleasant, imperfect decisions that affect other peoples' lives, and it means making honest attempts to truly understand how those institutions actually function in the actual world before howling for their overthrow commences. This might help keep us from being slapped down in debates by true policy pros who actually know what they are talking about but who lack awareness of the dogmatic assumptions from which they proceed, and who have not yet found a good reason to listen to jargon-riddled lectures from philosophers and culture critics with their snobish disrespect for the so-called "managerial class."

### Predictions Good

#### Scenario planning is possible in a catastrophe-ridden world—it’s vital to make predictions about the future.

**Kurasawa, 04** (Professor of Sociology, York University of Toronto, Fuyuki, Constellations Volume 11, No 4, 2004).

Independently of this contractualist justification, global civil society actors are putting forth a number of arguments countering temporal myopia on rational grounds. They make the case that no generation, and no part of the world, is immune from catastrophe. Complacency and parochialism are deeply flawed in that even if we earn a temporary reprieve, our children and grandchildren will likely not be so fortunate unless steps are taken today. Similarly, though it might be possible to minimize or contain the risks and harms of actions to faraway places over the short-term, parrying the eventual blowback or spillover effect is improbable. In fact, as I argued in the previous section, all but the smallest and most isolated of crises are rapidly becoming globalized due to the existence of transnational circuits of ideas, images, people, and commodities. Regardless of where they live, our descendants will increasingly be subjected to the impact of environmental degradation, the spread of epidemics, gross North-South socioeconomic inequalities, refugee flows, civil wars, and genocides. What may have previously appeared to be temporally and spatially remote risks are ‘coming home to roost’ in ever faster cycles. In a word, then, procrastination makes little sense for three principal reasons: it exponentially raises the costs of eventual future action; it reduces preventive options; and it erodes their effectiveness. With the foreclosing of long-range alternatives, later generations may be left with a single course of action, namely, that of merely reacting to large-scale emergencies as they arise. We need only think of how it gradually becomes more difficult to control climate change, let alone reverse it, or to halt mass atrocities once they are underway. Preventive foresight is grounded in the opposite logic, whereby the decision to work through perils today greatly enhances both the subsequent room for maneuver and the chances of success. Humanitarian, environmental, and techno-scientific activists have convincingly shown that we cannot afford not to engage in preventive labor. Moreover, I would contend that farsighted cosmopolitanism is not as remote or idealistic a prospect as it appears to some, for as Falk writes, “[g]lobal justice between temporal communities, however, actually seems to be increasing, as evidenced by various expressions of greater sensitivity to past injustices and future dangers.”36 Global civil society may well be helping a new generational self-conception take root, according to which we view ourselves as the provisional caretakers of our planetary commons. Out of our sense of responsibility for the well-being of those who will follow us, we come to be more concerned about the here and now.

#### Analyze on probability rather than on-face rejecting predictions – best middle ground

Fitzsimmons, 7 (Michael, “The Problem of Uncertainty in Strategic Planning”, Survival, Winter 06/07)

Much has been made about the defining role of uncertainty in strategic plan- ning since the end of the Cold War. With the end of bipolar competition, so the argument goes, and the accelerating pace of change in technology and inter- national political and economic relations, forecasting world events even a few years into the future has become exceedingly difficult. Indeed, few in the year 2000 would have described with much accuracy the current conditions facing national-security decision-makers. Moreover, history offers ample evidence, from the Schlieffen Plan to the Soviet economy, that rigid planning creates risks of catastrophic failure. Clearly, uncertainty demands an appreciation for the importance of flexibility in strategic planning. For all of its importance, however, recognition of uncertainty poses a dilemma for strategists: in predicting the future, they are likely to be wrong; but in resisting prediction, they risk clouding the rational bases for making strategic choices. Over-confidence in prediction may lead to good preparation for the wrong future, but wholesale dismissal of prediction may lead a strategist to spread ~~his~~ resources too thinly. In pursuit of flexibility, he ends up well pre- pared for nothing. A natural compromise is to build strategies that are robust across multiple alternative future events but are still tailored to meet the challenges of the most likely future events. Recent US national security strategy, especially in the Department of Defense, has veered from this middle course and placed too much emphasis on the role of uncertainty. This emphasis, paradoxically, illustrates the hazards of both too much allowance for uncertainty and too little. Current policies on nuclear-force planning and the results of the recent Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) are examples of overreaching for strategic flexibility. The record of planning for post-war operations in Iraq, by contrast, indicates that decision-makers, in enlisting uncertainty as a rationale for discounting one set of predictions, have fallen prey to overconfidence in their own alternative set of predictions. A more balanced approach to accounting for uncertainty in strategic planning would address a wide range of potential threats and security challenges, but would also incorporate explicit, transparent, probabilistic reasoning into planning processes. The main benefit of such an approach would not neces- sarily be more precise predictions of the future, but rather greater clarity and discipline applied to the difficult judgements about the future upon which strategy depends.

### Militarism Inevitable

#### Even non-violent movements inevitably become totalitarian and violent—the leaders cannot control the masses

Steger**,** Prof in the Dept of Politics and Government @ Illinois State U, 00 (Manfred B., *Gandhi’s Dilemma: Nonviolent Principles and Nationalist Power*)

Urging all Indians to crown the swadeshi campaign by publicly burning their foreign-made clothes, Gandhi spoke in glowing terms of the "inspiring sight" of large piles of garments going up in smoke: "And as the flames leapt up and enveloped the whole pyramid [of clothes], there was a shout of joy resounding through the air. It was as if our shackles had been broken asunder. A glow of freedom passed through the vast concourse. It was a noble act nobly performed."62 Yet, the flames of swadeshi kindled by thousands of ordinary Indian also symbolized, like no other satyagraha action, the fundamental tension at the core of Gandhi's nonviolent nationalism. For the Ma-hatma, the burning clothes manufactured in England conveyed India's economic, political, and spiritual emancipation from the threads of oppression. He viewed these spectacles as symbols of the nonviolent purification of a corrupted civilization and its materialist culture, and, therefore, the purgation of a tainted Indian identity. For others—including some of Gandhi's closest associates and friends, like Charlie Andrews—the flames of swadeshi signified a rather violent act of self-definition that seemed to be an ominous sign of things to come: the obliteration of the Other by nationalist passions set ablaze. Indeed, the first indication that Gandhi was incapable of controlling the nationalist passions of the masses set free during the noncooperation campaign came as early as April 1921, when a sub-inspector of police and four constables were killed in an act of mob violence provoked by the trial of Khilafat workers in the city of Malegaon. Gandhi chided the perpetrators for having "put back the hands of the clock of progress," and reminded them that, "Non-violence is the rock on which the whole structure of non-co-operation is built."63 Yet another incident took place in Bombay on November 17, 1921, the day the Prince of Wales arrived there for an official visit. Violent attacks were launched by Hindu and Muslim noncoop-erators upon Parsi and Christian Indians who had voluntarily taken part in the Prince's welcome. The violence escalated as many non-cooperators looted shops and burned clothes. Soon these actions expanded to the torching of entire buildings and the beating of government officials, ultimately leading to the deaths of several policemen and demonstrators. When, after three days of violence, the passions had finally cooled down, fifty-eight Bombay citizens had been killed and nearly four hundred had been injured.64

#### Power is zero sum –the alternative only shifts power elsewhere

John Mearsheimer, Professor at University of Chicago, 01† (The Tragedy of Great Power Politics p. 34)†

Consequently, states pay close attention to how power is distributed among them, and they make a special effort to maximize their share of world power. Specifically, they look for opportunities to alter the balance of power by acquiring additional increments of power at the expense of potential rivals. States employ a variety of means—economic, diplomatic, and military—to shift the balance of power in their favor, even if doing so makes other states suspicious or even hostile. Because one state’s gain in power is another state’s loss, great powers tend to have a zero-sum mentality when dealing with each other. The trick, of course, is to be the winner in this competition and to dominate the other states in the system. Thus, the claim that states maximize relative power is tantamount to arguing that states are disposed to think offensively toward other states, even though their ultimate motive is simply to survive. In short, great powers have aggressive intentions.